

I was shocked to hear that Sinclair Broadcasting was planning to air a two hour propoganda film against an American war hero who is running for president, and who happens not to share the very partisan views of this large media corporation. It's bad enough that we already have the so called "fair and balanced news" from Fox. Sinclair Broadcasting's decision to air this anti-Kerry "documentary" just before the election is a clear example of the dangers of media consolidation. How can they legally get away with that?

I am a strong believer in the free enterprise system on which our society is based. I also strongly believe that the government plays a critical role in maintaining that system by stopping monopolistic practices that can ultimately undermine that very system. I fear that media consolidation will ultimately have Orwellian consequences and will severely compromise our democracy. This Sinclair decision and the persistence of Fox (not) news are examples.

Sinclair uses the public airwaves free of charge, and is obligated by law to serve the public interest. But when large companies control the airwaves, we get more of what's good for the bottom line and less of what we need for our democracy. Instead of something produced at "News Central" far away, it's more important that we see real people from our own communities and more substantive news about issues that matter.

Sinclair's actions show why we need to strengthen media ownership rules, not weaken them. They show why the license renewal process needs to involve more than a returned postcard. Thank you.